

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,550	02/27/2002	Kazuhito Rokutan	ASAM.0051	5577
38327 REED SMITH	7590 10/07/200 LLP	EXAMINER		
3110 FAIRVIE	W PARK DRIVE, SU	DEJONG, ERIC S		
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22042	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/083,550	ROKUTAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ERIC S. DEJONG	1631		

	ERIC S. DEJONG	1631						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 27 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
1. So The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	of the final rejection.							
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i 	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(f		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any serined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be They raise new issues that would require further core They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec		ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Nation of Non Co.	maliant Amandment (DTOL 224)					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ripliant Amendment (F TOL-324).					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) thow the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2-10</u> .								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
	/Eric S DeJong/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1631						

Continuation of Item 7 NOTE

The Information Disclosure statement will not be entered onto the record at this time because it was filed after prosecution was closed in the instant case, see DIS filed 06/19/2008 and it entry would require further consideration and/or search of the prior art.

Continuation of Item 11. NOTE:

The rejection of claim 11 is maintained for reasons of record.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chenchik et al.

In regard to the rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 102(b), applicants argue reiterate previously presented arguments directed toawrd the deficiencies of Chenchik et al.

In response, applicants reiterated arguments are not persuasive for the reasons of record.

Applicants further argue that Chechnik et al. fails to teach the recited categories of (1)-(9).

In response it is maintained and reiterated from the instant rejection that Table 5 of Chechnik et al. teaches a pluriality of biopolymer sequences that read on the gene classification functions as recited in the instant claims (see pages 3-6 of the previous Office action, mailed 05/28/2008). Applicants argument amounts only to an allegation that the instant claims are differentiated over the prior art as said argument does not offer any evidence or identify any specific feature lacking in the prior art that would otherwise differentiate the bioplymers as taught in Table 5 from biopolymers that are encompassed under the recited categories of (1)(9).